

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 13 were amended, claim 14 was canceled and new claims 15-21 were added. Claims 1-13 and 15-21 are now pending.

### **The Office Action**

The Examiner objected to claim 2. Claim 2 was amended to recite "terminal identifier".

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morriss et al. in view of Kady. The Examiner stated that this combination of references teaches the limitations of placing the terminal in a Protected Mode, preventing outgoing calls from being made from the terminal and redirecting calls made to the terminal.

Independent claims 1 and 9, as amended, now recite that the terminal is placed in the Protected Mode by storing a Protected Mode indicator at a network element located remotely from the mobile communications terminal indicating that the Protected Mode has been activated for the terminal. This limitation distinguishes the invention as claimed from the combination of references cited. Morriss et al. operates to place the terminal in a Protected Mode by sending a message to the terminal as described on page 5 and more specifically in paragraphs 37 and 42. The invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9 places the terminal in the Protected Mode by storing the Protected Mode indicator on a network node which is located remotely from the terminal. Neither Morriss et al, nor Kady, teach or suggest this. Further this combination teaches away from the invention as claimed by teaching that the terminal places itself in the Protected Mode upon receiving a password whereas the invention as claimed recites placing the terminal in the Protected mode by storing a Protected Mode indicator at a network element located remotely from the mobile communications terminal indicating that the Protected Mode has been activated for the terminal. As a result, claims 1 and 9 as well as claims 2-13 and 15-21 depending therefrom, are patentable over the combination of Morriss et al and Kady.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-13 and 15-21) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone Patrick D. Floyd, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,  
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

February 22, 2006  
Date


  
Patrick D. Floyd  
Reg. No. 39,671  
1100 Superior Avenue  
Seventh Floor  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579  
216-861-5582

---

#### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

<b>Express Mail Label No.:</b>	<b>Signature</b> 
<b>Date</b> <b>February 22, 2006</b>	<b>Printed Name</b> <b>Roseanne Giuliani</b>

N:\LUTZ\200271\RLG0005352V001.doc